

**MANAGEMENT SUMMARY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA RECOVERY
EXCAVATIONS AT 38CH1219 AND 38CH123, KIAWAH ISLAND,
CHARLESTON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**

Prepared for:
Mr. Ray Pantlik
Kiawah Resort Associates
7 Beachwalker Dr.
Kiawah Island, S.C. 29455

Prepared by:
Ms. Natalie Adams

Chicora Research Contribution 148

Chicora Foundation, Inc.
PO Box 8664 ■ 861 Arbutus Dr.
Columbia, SC 29202
803/787-6910

July 25, 1994

This report is printed on permanent paper[∞]

ABSTRACT

This management summary describes the initial results of archaeological data recovery undertaken for Kiawah Resort Associates at 38CH1219 and 38CH123 on Kiawah Island in compliance with a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Kiawah Resort Associates and the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office.

38CH1219 consists of three small discrete shell middens situated at the edge of high ground overlooking low ground and marsh. Two of these middens were investigated with 400 square feet of excavations. These excavations produced primarily Deptford phase ceramics with small amounts of Savannah wares.

38CH123 (the West Pasture site) represents a large plantation complex which dates to the earliest period of historic occupation of the island through the early 20th century. Six areas of the site were investigated with 2100 square feet of excavations. These excavations uncovered all or portions domestic structures representing early 18th through mid 19th century occupations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	iii
List of Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Background	
Site Environs	
Historical Background	
Excavations at 38CH1219	14
Research Goals	
Field Methods	
Findings	
Summary	
Excavations at 38CH123	23
Research Goals	
Field Methods	
Findings	
Summary	
Sources Cited	37

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures

1	1971 USGS Kiawah Island quadrangle showing site locations	2
2	Locations of 38CH1219 and 38CH123 on site topographic map	3
3	1802 plat showing "Old Settlement"	7
4	The 1848 plat showing division of the Shoolbred old settlement	9
5	1863 tracing of the 1854 Coastal Survey of Kiawah Island	10
6	1866 Coastal Survey of Kiawah Island	11
7	Topographic map of 38CH1219 showing location of excavation units	15
8	Artifact and midden densities at 38CH1219	17
9	Plan and profile drawings of units excavated at 38CH1219	18
10	38CH1219, Feature 1 plan and profile	19
11	Features 2, 3, 4, and 5 profiles	20
12	Backhoe trenches at 38CH1219	21
13	Location of excavations at 38CH123	25
14	Excavations at Area 1	26
15	Excavations at Area 2	27
16	Excavations at Area 3	29
17	Excavations at Area 4	30
18	Excavations at Area 5	31
19	Topographic map of Area 5	32
20	Excavations at Area 6	34

LIST OF TABLES

1	Agricultural production in the east portion of the old Shoolbred plantation, 1850 and 1860	12
2	38CH1219, Shell midden content and density	22
3	38CH123, Shell midden content and density	35
4	Summary of excavations, 38CH123	36

INTRODUCTION

Background

A research design and proposal for data recovery excavations at 38CH1219 and 38CH123 was prepared on March 23, 1992 and revised on April 25, 1994. The proposal was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office for review and comment. Our office was informed that the proposal was acceptable without modification, although the S.C. SHPO requested clarification in several areas of the research (April 11, 1994, letter from Mr. Lee Tippet to Ms. Tina Hadden, Army Corps of Engineers). These comments were addressed on April 15, 1994 (letter from Dr. Michael Trinkley to Mr. Clarence Ham, Army Corps of Engineers).

The field investigations were scheduled for May 17, 1994 through May 22, 1994 at 38CH1219 (for a total of five field days), and May 25, 1994 through July 9, 1994 at 38CH123 (for a total of 40 field days). Dr. Michael Trinkley was the Principal Investigator for the project and Ms. Natalie Adams was the Field Director. Field Archaeologists included Mr. Ryan Boera, Mr. Tariq Ghaffar, Mr. Spencer Mullins, and Ms. Lyn Roberts.

38CH1219 was initially identified by Chicora Foundation during an archaeological survey conducted in 1991. During the survey, the site was identified as a single small discrete shell midden measuring about 10 feet in diameter. Although small, the midden contained excellent physical integrity which would allow questions of intra-site spatial patterning or activity areas associated with potentially a single occupation to be explored. As a result the site was recommended as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (see Trinkley 1993:134-136).

Originally, John Combes (1974:A-14) recorded 38CH123 as a protohistoric Indian village with eighteenth and nineteenth century remains. A portion of the site was further investigated by Jim Michie in 1978. Michie's work has not been published, although it was apparently undertaken as a preliminary step in a data recovery project which was never conducted. Michie excavated a series of 43 1-meter units at 15 meter intervals (covering an area about 400 by 300 feet). This work took place in the portion of the site originally identified by Combes, but failed to identify site boundaries.

The artifacts recovered by Michie span the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, clearly documenting the site's intensive use during this period. There was, however, little evidence to support Combes' contention that the site might represent a Kiawah Indian village.

In 1991 Chicora Foundation excavated a series of 49 shovel tests to determine the site boundaries. Based on the distribution of materials from these tests, coupled with surface collections, the site was estimated to measure about 1500 feet north-south by 600 feet east-west.

The site was recommended as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places since research would provide an opportunity to examine nearly the complete range of plantation occupations on the island since other, later, plantations (e.g. Vanderhorst and Shoolbred) had previously been recommended as eligible.

Site Environs

Kiawah Island is situated in Charleston County, south of the City of Charleston, and is bordered to the north and west by the Kiawah River, to the east by the Stono River and Inlet, and to the south by the Atlantic Ocean. The island is separated from neighboring Folly Island to the east by the Stono Inlet, from

Seabrook Island to the west by Kiawah River, and Johns Island to the north by the Kiawah River and the associated marshes (Figure 1).

38CH1219 is situated on well-drained Seabrook while 38CH123 is located on well drained Wando soils (although a small portion of the site is located on poorly drained Dawhoo soils). Both sites overlook the marshes of the Kiawah River, although 38CH123 is located at the river's confluence of Salt House Creek and runs linearly along the creek (Figure 2).

Topography at 38CH1219 consists of a linear ridge running west-southwest by east-northeast and drops off to the north toward the marsh and inland to the south. Elevations at the site range from 6.2 feet inland to the south to 7.4 feet on the crest of the ridge. This site is located on a well drained point of land overlooking the Kiawah River, similar to a number of other prehistoric sites in the Charleston County area (Brooks and Scurry 1978).

Vegetation at 38CH1219 was dense during the survey and the data recovery and required hand clearing before the site grid could be established. The understory was moderately thick and consisted of wax myrtle and palmetto.

Topography at 38CH123 was relatively level, although southern portions of the site exhibited dune ridge and trough relief. Elevations at the site range from approximately 10 feet on the crests of dune ridges to about 5 feet in the troughs. Most of the site was situated at elevations between 7 and 9 feet. As stated previously, the site is situated at the confluence of the Kiawah River and Salt House Creek. The settlement was arranged linearly along the east bank of the creek.

The vegetation at 38CH123 was so thick that a hydro-ax was used to clear the site enough to lay in a site grid and to allow for easy access to all areas of the site. The hydro-ax is more aggressive than a bush hog and allowed the site to be cleared much more quickly. It proved to be quite successful at clearing the site while not significantly damaging the ground surface. The understory vegetation consisted of wax myrtle, palmetto, muscodine, and green briar.

Historical Background

Previous detailed historical research on 38CH123 by Chicora Foundation has been published in Chicora Foundation Research Series 30, and is summarized below.

Kiawah Island, a plantation of 2700 acres, was granted to Captain George Raynor by the Lords Proprietors on March 29, 1699 (South Carolina Historical Society). Raynor sold half of Kiawah Island to a Captain William Davis about a year after his initial purchase, on November 1, 1701 (South Carolina Historical Society, Misc. Deeds). The other half interest or moiety he passed to his daughter in his will (Charleston County RMC DB Y, p. 182). Mary Raynor Moore moved to the Cape Fear area of North Carolina with her husband Roger in 1723. Roger Moore sold Kiawah Island to John Stanyarne in October 1717 (Charleston County RMC DB N, p. 119).

The other moiety of Kiawah, sold by Raynor to William Davis, was passed from Davis to his widow, Elizabeth. She married William Wilkins and sold the property (as executor of her late husband's estate) on July 12, 1708 to Richard Peterson, Jr. (Charleston County RMC DB N, p. 113). The moiety eventually passed from Richard Peterson to his son, John Peterson. Apparently a minor, the property was managed by Jonathan Drake, who on January 4, 1722/3 sold John Stanyarne the "whole stock of cattle also the hoges bothe tame and wild" on "Koyawave" for £300. Further, Stanyarne was to have "use of that part of the Island which is now in the posation of said John Drake In behalf of said Peterson" (South Carolina Historical Society 12/194/30).

John Peterson died in September 1727 and his property was inherited by his aunts, Elizabeth Porter (of North Carolina) and Eleanor White (late of Jamaica). They, in turn, sold their one-half of Kiawah

to John Stanyarne, who had been previously leasing the island, for £600 (Charleston RMC DB N, p. 129). This united the island under one ownership; the first time since Raynor, 33 years earlier.

It is known that Stanyarne began cattle farming on Kiawah as early as 1722/3. It also seems likely that it was during this early period when agricultural pursuits were introduced to Kiawah. There is good evidence that Stanyarne actively participated in the indigo economy. The appraisal and inventory of his estate listed a total of 296 slaves working on his plantations -- six on Johns Island totalling 1974 acres, one on St. Helena with 1040 acres, and Kiawah with 2700 acres, plus his Charleston house. Agricultural implements, tools, and produce included a lot of indigo seed; seven casks; 17 indigo hooks; a wire sieve; five sets of indigo vats, press cloths, and pumps; three pair rice sieves; 15 rice mills with mortars and pestles; 300 bushels of seed rice; a "win fann for Rice"; 14 bushels old indigo seed; 29 bushels new indigo seed; 63 Indigo vats and "furniture"; and crops of rice and indigo from his Johns Island and Kiawah plantations. While not divided in the inventory, it is likely that the Johns Island plantations produced rice, while Kiawah produced indigo. Henry Laurens served as a factor for Stanyarne, shipping as much as 6000 pounds of indigo at a time to England. At the rate of 40 pounds per acre this suggests Stanyarne was planting about 150 acres in indigo, requiring perhaps 30 slaves.

John Stanyarne's estate, excluding lands, was valued at £146,246.9.2 (S.C. Currency, or approximately £20,474 sterling). In 1992 dollars (Jones 1980:10), Stanyarne's estate was worth nearly \$2.5 million. Less than 19% of South Carolina's plantations fell into this category (Coclanis 1989:86).

Other items at Johns and Kiawah islands included: walnut chairs, tables, gilt looking glasses, a clock, four hunting prints, floor cloths, window blinds, mahogany and cypress tables, tea tables, poplar and pine beadsteads, mattresses, easy and arm chairs, silver castors, candlesticks, silk umbrellas, a rum case, brass scales and weights, curtains, guns and pistols, books, pewter, earthenware, glass, kitchen furniture, iron pots and kettles, milk pans, and green handled knives and forks. Plantation implements included carpenter's tools, shoemaker's tools, an auger, staves and heads, cedar posts, an ox cart, two horse carts, five boats or canoes, iron wedges, spades, a grist mill, whip and crosscut saws, nails (20p, 10p, and 4p), window glass, cut lumber, and a "lott of old iron."

Produce and provisions on the plantations included one jar of hog lard, 36 bottles of wine, two jugs of linseed oil, 158 pounds of tallow, 456 pounds of myrtle wax, rice flour, 2649 bushels of corn, peas, 2 barrels of pitch, potatoes, and corn blades. The current rice crop was valued at £4368, while the indigo crop was valued at £6098. Stock included 31 horses, 206 heads of cattle, 16 head of oxen, 55 hogs, and 50 head of sheep. Of the 296 slaves, 97 were male, 90 were female, and 109 were children. Their total value was £90,310 or approximately 62% of the estate (Charleston County WPA Inventories, vol. 94B, pp. 436-444).

Stanyarne's will, dated August 27, 1772 and proved December 22, 1772 provided that his grand daughter, Mary Gibbes, would receive as a life estate the southwestern moiety of "my Island Called Kiawah Island, wheron a dwelling--house now stands, containing one Thousand Three hundred and fifty acres of Land" (this plantation consists of archaeological sites 38CH122 and 38CH123). The other moiety was devised to Stanyarne's grand daughter Elizabeth Vanderhorst.

The impact of the American Revolution was perhaps hardest felt in economic terms. Charleston was seized and held by the British for 2½ years, from 1780 to 1782. In addition, the removal of Royal bounties on rice, indigo, and naval stores caused considerable economic chaos with the eventual restructuring of the state's agricultural and economic base.

It is unclear exactly what activities were taking place on Kiawah, although in 1782, General Nathaniel Greene arranged for a truce to allow American officers to use Kiawah Island for rest and recuperation. Apparently the party going to Kiawah included Greene's wife, Catherine; Dr. Robert Johnson, Hospital Physician and Surgeon, Southern Department; Colonel William Washington and his wife, Jane Elliot Washington; Colonel Lewis Morris; Major Pierce; and Captain Nathaniel Pendleton, Jr.

and his brother. Colonel Morris wrote his fiancée, Ann Elliot on August 24, 1782 that they were to begin the trip to Kiawah the following day:

we shall travel with a cook and all the materials for a table, and depend upon the sea for our support (Anonymous 1939:133).

It is clear from other letters, however, that the group was well provisioned, eating duck, chicken, beef, crab, fish prawn, and potatoes, while drinking coffee and wine (Stegeman and Stegeman 1977:98).

The group apparently stayed at the Gibbes plantation on Kiawah and Pendleton wrote Greene complaining of the lack of hospitality shown to the group by their host, Robert Gibbes (part of this inhospitable behavior was a shortage of wine) (McCaskey 1990:88).

While Robert Gibbes' daughter, Mary, had a life estate in the southern moiety, and she married Thomas Middleton on November 3, 1774, she died the following year, giving birth to her daughter, Mary. Although her husband, Thomas lived until 1779, he had no right to the plantation and played an insignificant part in Kiawah's history. It is likely that on Mary Gibbes Middleton's death, her father, Robert Gibbes (a Charleston merchant and factor, as well as a planter), assumed operation of the plantation in trust for his grand daughter, Mary, and was thus assumed to be the owner by Greene's officers.

McCaskey (1990:88) suggests that Gibbes' behavior reflected his personal sentiments and loyalties to the Crown. There may be some truth in this considering that Kiawah had seen the darker side of the Revolution. A house built on Kiawah by Arnoldus Vanderhorst II, husband of Elizabeth Raven, sometime shortly after inheritance of the northern moiety, had been burned by the British in 1780, immediately before their occupation of Charleston. That the Gibbes Plantation survived unscathed perhaps reflects the divided sentiments on Kiawah Island during the Revolution.

Shortly after the American Revolution, about 1797, Mary Gibbes Middleton, daughter of Thomas and Mary Middleton, married James Shoolbred, bringing with her fee simple ownership (as the third generation descendant of John Stanyarne) in administration of William Pitt. Surprisingly little else is known about the man or his activities on Kiawah Island. The Shoolbred Papers at the Charleston Library Society (Manuscript #62) deal almost entirely with Shoolbred's oversight of his father's business in Canada. After their marriage, they built a new settlement on what is now known as Rhett's Bluff while using the old settlement as a base of plantation operations.

The Shoolbreds were unhappy the Vanderhorsts because of shell gathering on that they felt were their marshes. Shoolbred claimed that the oyster beds were on his property, based on the partition of the island. Due to this dispute between Shoolbred and Vanderhorst over ownership of the oyster beds on Kiawah, a survey was made of the island. The surveyor, John Hardwicke, determined that the oyster grounds in question were not part of the original grant of the island, which was the highland only. As a result, the jury found Vanderhorst innocent of any wrongs and ordered Shoolbred to pay court costs (South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Judgement Roll 750A).

The resulting plat (Figure 3) provides the first plan of the island's settlements and shows the configuration of the old Stanyarne Plantation (shown as Old Settlement), now owned by the Shoolbreds. The plat shows six structures at the "Old Settlement", with the largest of these, perhaps the main house, adjacent to a landing. As previously discussed, the old settlement is thought to represent the initial Stanyarne settlement (and later Gibbes) on Kiawah, with the main house perhaps in the vicinity of what later became the Seabrook Plantation.

Shoolbred plantation was more of a retreat or country seat than an intensively operating plantation. It is clear that Shoolbred was making changes to the property -- the largest of which was the relocation of the main settlement shown on the 1802 plat of Kiawah (Figure 3). This move, however, left behind a nucleus of support structures and at least a portion of the slave settlement. The "old settlement"

continued to serve as the major landing on the island, apparently used by both Shoolbred and Vanderhorst.

James Shoolbred died in 1847. His will, proved November 17, 1847, specified that the plantation would be divided into two parts (Charleston County Wills, Book K, p. 138). To John Gibbes Shoolbred (his son), in trust for Mary Drayton (James' daughter and the widow of Charles Drayton) he devised:

the eastern part of Plantation on Kiawah Island, bounded on the East by the line which separates it from General Vanderhorst's part of the said Island . . . on the North by the Kiawah River, on the South by the Atlantic Ocean and the west by the middle of Salt House Creek down to my carting dam, and thence by a line in continuation of the above line to the Atlantic Ocean, together with all the buildings and improvements within the said boundaries including the settlement on Wall Point (Rhett's Bluff), also all the furniture, household goods, and silver plates at my Kiawah house, the Canoes Paul and Robuck the Sloop build by W. Bird in 1846, the mail boat, etc. and the horned cattle, sheep, Goats, swine, the utensils of husbandry and everything of the nature of personal estate on said part of said Plantation or used or enjoyed therewith; also the following Negro slaves, to wit, Ben, and Tenny and their five children, Solomon, Pender, Harry, Lilly, and Cato, Siddy, Moses and Kate, Joe and Kit, Cattle Joe, Swine Peter, February & Suckey, Jack and Sarah, John, Cuffy, Ned Sikey and Primus . . . and from and after the decease of the said Mary Drayton . . . to her children living at the time of her decease.

To the children of his deceased daughter, Ann Burrill, named as John Ebenezer Burrill, Mary Burrill, Shoolbred Burrill, and Drayton Burrill (all living in New York), he devised:

all that part of my Plantation on Kiawah Island lying to the west of the part herein before devised in trust for my daughter Mary Drayton.

The plat of this division, shown in Figure 4, reveals that the island's landing was well developed, and included a wharf on the east side of the inlet called Salt House Creek. The central part of the island was cleared for cotton fields and a bank had been established on the ocean side of the island, probably to limit flooding. Several roads ran east-west across the island, and the cart path across Salt House Creek suggests that there were still major utilitarian buildings existing on the west side of the inlet.

At Mary Drayton's death in 1855, the eastern portion of Shoolbred's plantation passed to her sons, Thomas Henry Middleton Drayton and John Drayton (Charleston County Wills, Book L 1851-1856, p. 410). In 1855 the plantation included the house, outbuildings, cattle, horses, mules, and 75 slaves. The two brothers held the plantation until January 16, 1860, when they sold it to Isaac Wilson, who mortgaged the island to them to guarantee payments (Charleston County RMC).

The property devised by Shoolbred to the children of Ann Burrill was sold in March 1854 to William Seabrook (Charleston County RMC, DB L13, p. 81, DBL13, p. 85).

Agricultural activity continued on the eastern portion of Shoolbred's estate, although there is no evidence that any activity was taking place on that portion sold by the Burrill's to Seabrook. Table 1 details the 1850 and 1860 agricultural censuses. By 1860, under the ownership of Isaac Wilson, the plantation improved acreage had gone down, although cotton production went up by 6 bales. This change was accomplished with 31 slaves, compared to the 51 owned by Mary Drayton 10 years earlier. This increase in the cash crop, however, was also accompanied by a decrease in important provision commodities such as corn, oats, peas, and butter. It appears that while Wilson was attempting to make the plantation profitable with a cash crop, he was also placing himself in the position of purchasing more provision crops on the open market.

A dramatic demographic change, beyond a simple reduction in number, had also taken place in

the slave population on the plantation. While the 1850 population included 16 males and 16 females over the age of 15, as well as 19 children, by 1860 there were only nine males compared to 16 females, with five children. This radical shift may have been the result of Wilson not only trying to trim costs by reducing the population, but may also indicate an effort to farm with less costly female slaves. Of the nine male slaves held by Wilson, a third were over the age of 40, compared to only 12% 10 years earlier.

The best view of Kiawah Island is provided by an 1863 tracing of the 1854 Coastal Survey Map entitled, "Kiawah River and Island and Portions of Folly, Cole's, John's and Seabrook's Islands" (Figure 5). On the west side of Salt House Creek (38CH122) there is a settlement consisting of 16 structures surrounded by a fence. These include a double row slave settlement with eight houses, seven support structures, and the main house. This portion of the Shoolbred Plantation had been passed to the Burrills, who then sold it to William Seabrook. On the east side of Salt House Creek (38CH123) there are a series of 16 structures consisting of nine slave houses and seven outbuildings. It is unlikely that any of the structures shown were a main house since Mary Drayton inherited not only the complex east of the creek, but also the Shoolbred plantation house on Rhett's Bluff.

There are some differences between the original 1854 map and the 1863 tracing. Many of these differences may be due to the map being updated or, more likely, incorrect transferral of structures and features from the original. Nonetheless, these differences are worthy of note.

On the west side of Salt House Creek, the main house area is shown in more detail. Within a fenced area is the main house, which almost certainly was Stanyarne's original structure built on Kiawah Island, and three additional outbuildings, one of which was probably the kitchen. In addition, the whole settlement is surrounded by a fence. Nineteen structures are found on this map. On the east side of the creek there are a series of 19 structures scattered along several roads. The wharf projects from the eastern side into Salt House Creek. This entire area is labeled "Drayton's," representing the portion of the Shoolbred Plantation devised to Mary Drayton and sold by her sons in 1860 to Isaac Wilson.

It is clear from the 1866 Coastal Survey map (Figure 6) that Kiawah had changed. The Seabrook settlement is reduced to 14 structures, although the main house (presumably the original Stanyarne main house) is still standing. The cluster of structures east of Salt House Creek is reduced to 11.

In addition, court action was brought against Isaac Wilson in 1866 by Wallace Lawton for various unpaid mortgages and the Court of Equity directed that Wilson's property should be sold. Wilson's portion of the Shoolbred estate, described as:

Table 1.
Agricultural Production on the Eastern Portion of the Old Shoolbred Plantation in 1850 and 1860

	1850-Drayton	1860-Wilson
Acreage, improved	400	300
Acreage, unimproved	94	142
Cash value (\$)	10000	11000
Value of implements/ equipment (\$)	600	150
Horses		10
Asses/Mules	3	3
Milk cows	40	40
Working oxen	16	8
Other cattle		20
Sheep	30	50
Swine	40	
Value of livestock (\$)	760	2000
Value of slaughtered animals (\$)	100	200

Corn (bu.)	1100	500	
Oats (bu.)	250		
Hay (tons)		15	
Cotton (bales @400 lbs.)		14	20
Peas (bu.)	220	150	
Sweet potatoes (bu.)	1000	1400	
Wool (lbs.)	60	200	
Butter (lbs.)	480	200	

that plantation or tract of land lying and being on Kiawah Island in District of Colleton and State aforesaid: measuring and containing -- Butting and Bounding Northwardly on the Atlantic Ocean, Southwardly on Kiawah River [these two boundaries were accidentally reverse in the deed], Eastwardly on Lands of Elias Vanderhorst, and Westwardly on lands of William Seabrook (Charleston County RMC, DB D15, p. 405).

was sold to James Gibbes for \$4510. Gibbes was a grandson of James and Mary Shoolbred and a cousin of Thomas Henry Middleton Drayton and John Drayton, who had originally sold the property to Wilson in 1860. Gibbes' intent was to maintain the property within the family, and when his daughter Amelia S. Gibbes married John Haile, a marriage settlement stipulated that the property would pass from Amelia to her children. If the children failed to reach legal age, the Kiawah plantation would revert back to James Gibbes or his estate (Charleston County RMC, DB C16, p. 293). It was also during the early postbellum years that Seabrook's portion of Kiawah Island was transferred, through indeterminate means, to William Gregg.

The early 1870s saw additional property changes on Kiawah. In 1873 James Gibbes devised the eastern half of the Shoolbred property, which he purchased in 1868, to his daughter, Amelia Gibbes. Rather than as an outright deed, the property was held in trust for Amelia's children (Charleston County RMC, DB H16, p. 413). William Gregg, who had acquired Seabrook's western half of the Shoolbred plantation, went bankrupt in 1872 and in March 1873 the property was conveyed by the assignee of William Gregg to H.H. Hutchinson (Charleston County RMC, DB H16, p. 413).

In 1893 John and Amelia Gibbes Haile's only child, James Haile, died without issue. As a result of the marriage settlement the Haile's Kiawah property reverted back to the estate of James Gibbes and in 1900 Adele Vanderhorst purchased the property for \$3500. For the first time since John Stanyarne's ownership in the first half of the eighteenth century, Kiawah Island was united under a single ownership (Charleston County RMC, DB Y22, p. 592).

Adele Vanderhorst died in 1915, leaving her estate evenly divided between her children Arnoldus Vanderhorst V and Elias Vanderhorst (Charleston County Probate Court, Wills Book Y, p. 15). Arnoldus Vanderhorst V died December 21, 1943, six years after his elder brother, Elias. With the death of Arnoldus, it fell upon William Weston, the last surviving executor of Adele Vanderhorst, to dispose of the estate. Although a life-long friend to Adele, the greatest act of friendship may have been to continue as executor when confronted by the bickering of the family. To settle the matter and distribute the estate, Weston filed suit in Charleston County on November 1, 1944, asking "inter alia" for instructions from the Court.

While this action progressed, Weston continued to care for the island. Charlie Scott, the last Black living on the island, was paid \$100 a year to serve as caretaker. Scott lived just east of Salt House Creek as indicated by the USGS description of the location of the Scott USGS survey marker. In a 1951 interview

Scott recalled Kiawah about 1915, remembering 28 Black tenant farmers on the island. Between 250 and 300 pounds of sea island cotton were produced per acre. He specified 31 structures, including one house for whites with two rooms, one four room house for whites, the "Big House" (Vanderhorst plantation main house) with nine rooms (apparently counting the pantry as a room), and a kitchen structure with two or three rooms. Also present were 20 single houses with two rooms and six double houses with four rooms for the Blacks. He also mentioned the presence of a frame church on the island, possible the Kiawah School which closed in the early 1900s. The island dock, probably at Draytons, was 16 feet wide and 150 feet long (Interview by American Appraisal Company, ms. on file, Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia).

On April 30, 1947 Judge W.H. Grumball ordered that Weston was empowered to sell the estate of Adele Vanderhorst. On December 5, 1950 Weston found a buyer in C.C. Royal of Royal Lumber Company in 1950 (Charleston County Probate Court, Book I, p. 331).

In 1974 the heirs of C.C. Royal sold Kiawah Island to Coastal Shores, Inc., a subsidiary of Kuwait Investment Corporation for over \$17 million (*News and Courier*, October 30, 1979).

EXCAVATIONS AT 38CH1219

Research Goals

The survey report by Trinkley (1993) touched on a variety of research questions that 38CH1219 might address, including issues of intra-site patterning and organization, the artifacts present at the site, and the ecofacts primarily associated with the midden. Therefore, the data recovery research concentrated on four areas:

- The types of subsistence remains (ethnobotanical, faunal, and shellfish) present at the site, their contributions to the prehistoric diet, and evidence of resource scheduling;
- How these remains compare to other shell midden sites of the same time period excavated elsewhere in the Charleston and Beaufort areas;
- The remains of structures or other evidence of occupation and settlement adjacent to the site; and
- The typological information provided by the recovered ceramics and lithics.

Field Methods

Prior to any archaeological investigations, the understory vegetation was cleared by hand in an area measuring 80 by 100 feet. This allowed easy access to all parts of the site and provided for easier gridding and topographic mapping.

The site was tied into a permanent grid to provide both horizontal and vertical control. Vertical control was tied to a the Scott USGS survey marker located approximately 600 feet west of the site. The USGS marker is at an elevation of 6.19 feet mean sea level (MSL). The datum at 38CH1219 consisted of iron rebar located at auger test 5 at an elevation of 6.16 MSL. The site grid was oriented with magnetic north.

At this Deptford phase shell midden, we proposed to excavate at least 400 square feet, bisecting the midden identified during the survey. The first phase of the work consisted of auger testing the site at 10 foot intervals. Originally, Chicora had proposed testing at 20 foot intervals, but later decided given the small size of the site that only 10 foot intervals could provide the needed resolution to best understand the patterning of the site. The auger tests explored artifact density on and adjacent to the midden and a contour map was prepared at an interval of 0.2 feet (Figure 7).

The second phase of work consisted of the excavation of midden and non-midden units, placed on the basis of the auger survey. During this phase shell columns were collected for specialized analysis of the shellfish remains. Incorporated into this methodology was a variety of approaches first explored by Chicora Foundation at 38CH861, including the collection of pollen samples, the collection of soil for specialized study of oyster snails, and the fine screening (through $\frac{1}{8}$ -inch mesh) of samples of midden fill.

Units were established using a modified Chicago 10-foot grid, with each square designated by its southeast corner, from a 0R0 point at the southwest corner of the site. Thus, the southeast corner of square 10R20 would be located north 10 feet and right (or east) 20 feet from the 0R0 point.

The excavations were conducted using gross natural stratigraphic zones. Zone 1 consists of brown loamy sand with varying densities of shell, varying in depth from 0.8 to 1.0 foot in depth. Zone 2 consists of the underlying old humus layer, varying in depth from 0.3 to 0.7 feet in depth where it existed. Below Zone 1 or 2 lies a tan to yellow sandy subsoil.

Flotation samples (typically 5 gallons in size) were collected from areas which exhibited a high potential for the recovery of ethnobotanical remains. A 5% sample of shell midden from each excavation unit was collected for information on species diversity, midden density, and shellfish analysis. The remaining shell would be weighed, and discarded, in the field. To maximize the amount of charcoal from the samples we have also refloated the heavy fraction using a method recommended by Dr. Gail Wagner with excellent success.

All fill was screened minimally through $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch mesh, with samples of shell midden soils sampled through $\frac{1}{8}$ -inch mesh which was water screened for improved data recovery. Chicora Foundation also a column sample (2.25 feet square) of all shell midden for detailed analysis, including shell midden density, shellfish analysis, and identification of very small faunal remains.

Each 10 by 10 foot unit was excavated in 25 square foot quadrants and was troweled at the top of subsoil. All units were plotted and photographed (in black and white negative and color slide film) as well as all features (i.e. pits and post holes) encountered during the excavations. Profile and plan views were drawn of each unit.

Features were bisected to provide profiles, photographs, and drawings, and feature fill was screened through $\frac{1}{8}$ -inch mesh and samples were taken for water flotation.

The last phase of work consisted of grading midden and near-by non-midden areas to explore the total site area. While this approach is not normally used by Chicora Foundation, the site was ideal for testing this approach since the tree cover was light, heavy equipment was readily available, and the site was small.

Chicora Foundation also used pH neutral, alkaline-buffered paper for field notes. Photographic materials will be processed to archival permanence. Standard forms, such as daily reports, level forms, photographic forms, and feature forms were used to maintain site information.

Excavations are to be backfilled at the conclusion of the project through the use of heavy equipment to be provided by the client. During the project, excavation units were roped off and covered with black plastic.

A total of 227.5 person hours were spent at the site resulting in the excavation of 400 square feet or 410 cubic feet. These excavations resulted in 3,098 lbs. of shell. A small quantity of brick was recovered and consisted of negligible weights per 25 square feet.

Findings

Although this management summary has been prepared immediately upon completion of the field work, it is possible to offer general comments concerning some areas of research. Figure 7 represents our uncorrected field map or site plan. It includes all auger tests and excavation units. Figure 3 provides information of artifact density and shell midden density. Figure 8 reveals a long linear midden running from the southeast to the northwest while artifacts cluster in immediately adjacent areas indicating a strong negative correlation between shell midden and artifacts suggesting that the middens are contemporaneous and that living areas were adjacent, but not on, the middens. The middens were found to be deposited on sterile sand and a submidden humus was present.

Excavated Areas

All of the excavated units were placed contiguously in an area straddling two discrete shell middens and explored both midden and near midden areas (Figure 9). Excavations revealed that the northwest midden was intact and overlies a shell filled trench containing prehistoric materials (Feature 1). This trench varies in width from 0.8 feet to 1.5 feet and ranges in depth from 0.2 feet to 1.47 feet. Given the configuration of the feature, it is most likely structural although no individual posts were recognized (Figure 10). Stripping to the north and west of this area did not reveal any additional stains associated with this feature. It is possible that if the structure did continue in this area that the features were too shallow to be recognized using the backhoe. Monitoring during the use of the backhoe did not reveal any stains which were visible at higher levels, but later disappeared with continued depth.

The midden in the southeast portion of excavations was likewise undisturbed except along its northwest edge where a long wide trench (Feature 3) was uncovered. Upon excavation of a portion of the trench, the profile indicated relatively steep sides and a flat bottom resting on marsh mud (Figure 11). Its configuration and the presence of historic artifacts (e.g. bottle glass) suggested that the feature functioned as a historic drainage ditch, probably draining water away from higher parts of the area into the marsh.

Two additional features were identified in excavations. Both features 2 and 4 are shell refuse pits located between the two middens, indicating that activities took place adjacent to the middens. Both pits were small (suggesting single use) and contained primarily oysters (Figure 11). Unfortunately, none of these features yielded a sufficient quantity of clams for seasonality studies.

Table 2.
38CH1219, Shell Midden Content and Density, weight in pounds.

Excavation Unit	Percent by Wt.						Total Wt.	Wt./Ft ³
	Shell:Soil	Oyster	Clam	Whelk	Periwinkle	Other		
90R90	1:1.41	96.6	--	2.0	1.4	--	681	6.81
90R100	1:3.41	96.5	0.7	2.1	0.7	--	676	6.14
100R90	1:1.06	94.6	3.9	1.2	0.2	0.1	1623	14.75
100R100	--	80.4	2.0	4.0	12.1	1.2	118	1.18

Stripping at the site at the conclusion of the controlled excavations consisted of four backhoe trenches about 8 feet wide with a combined length of 135 feet (Figure 12). This stripping uncovered only

one additional feature which consisted of another shell pit (Feature 5). If this pit follows the pattern of the other two shell pits, then the feature most likely was located in a non-midden area. In fact, neither the adjacent east or west profile indicated very dense midden in this vicinity, although the east profile contained relatively abundant shell.

Table 2 provides information of the content of the middens explored, including the density of shellfish and the species present.

The table reveals that the shell to soil ratio is not consistent in the middens nor weight per cubic foot. Interestingly the most diverse assemblage of shellfish was recovered from the unit with the lowest concentration of shell. There is much higher percentages of whelk, periwinkle, and other (including oyster drills, arcs, and tagelus).

Water screening at the site yielded very few floral remains. However, a few species were identified including palmetto berries, hickory nutshell, and china berries. It is probable that some of these species may not have been found if not for the waterscreening. Very few faunal remains were recovered in waterscreening.

Summary

Although the results of the data recovery efforts cannot be summarized since the analysis has not been conducted, it is possible to evaluate some aspects of the work. For example, the methodology proposed has been implemented with few changes and none of those have adversely affected the data recovery efforts.

The auger testing, excavations, and site stripping have revealed that traditional survey techniques do not always identify the configuration and full extent of the site. For example, the survey identified only one midden while the data recovery efforts identified three discrete middens. While the data recovery indicated that the site was 90 feet north-south by 80 feet east-west, the core of the site did not extend beyond the 50 feet by 50 feet boundaries established during the survey.

One interesting aspect of the species identification at 38CH1219 is that one of the units (100R100) contained at least 14.2% fewer oysters than the rest of the excavations, suggesting that sites should not be generalized in terms of percentage of shellfish content since it can vary significantly within the same site.

Although the waterscreening produced few floral remains, it was successful since it was the only method which recovered floral evidence (beyond wood charcoal).

EXCAVATIONS AT 38CH123 (THE WEST PASTURE SITE)

Research Goals

Based on the previous research at 38CH123 a number of research question were posed which the site was believed to be able to address. The research at 38CH123 concentrated on five areas:

- The temporal period(s) of site occupation;
- The types of subsistence remains (ethnobotanical, faunal, and shellfish) present at the site and their contribution to plantation diet;
- How the remains at 38CH123 compare to other plantation sites of the same time period excavated both on Kiawah Island and elsewhere in South Carolina;
- The remains of structures or other evidence of occupation and settlement at the site; and
- How the archaeological evidence can contribute to our understanding of the changing economics of the plantation through time.

Field Methods

The initial survey of the West Pasture Site revealed that the remains were scattered over a large area. This finding is clearly supported by the historic documentation, such as maps of the site area which show structures paralleling Salt House Creek (see Figure 5). The survey, however, was hampered by two primary factors:

- (1) the dense vegetation resulting from years of site abandonment, and
- (2) the deposit of spoil over portions of the site area.

Consequently, Chicora proposed a phased approach which would ensure complete access to the site, examination of site areas which exhibit concentrations of archaeological materials (including structural remains), and an overview of the archaeological resources present.

The first phase of work consisted of Kiawah Resort Associates clearing the dense vegetation using a hydro-ax. In addition, the spoil piles were removed by Kiawah Resort Associates under the direction of an archaeologist. The backhoe operator (Mr. Gary Otter) has worked with us on a number of other archaeological projects and was very skilled at peeling off the overburden to the ground surface.

The second phase of work consisted of auger testing the entire site at 50 foot intervals. During the auger testing, field density maps were compiled and served as a guide for the placement of excavation units. Integrated into this phase of the research was metal detecting of selected areas with the goal of identifying structural remains.

The third phase of the work consisted of block excavations in areas identified during auger testing. As previously proposed, five areas of highest interest were examined with 400 square feet, totaling 2000 square feet. In addition, a sixth area was examined with 100 square feet. As a result, a total of 2100 square feet were

excavated at 38CH123.

The grid was oriented with magnetic north and was tied into the Scott USGS marker (6.19 MSL) and the Scott USGS Reference Point 1 marker. These provided vertical and horizontal control. Rebar was placed at the northeast and northwest corners of the grid at auger tests 1 and 7. Impermanent datums (gutter spikes) were placed throughout the site as reference points for laying in excavation units. These points were located at auger tests 3, 40, 48, 58, 80, 83, 101, 102, 127, 128, 148, 151, and 163.

Units were established using the modified Chicago 10-foot grid system described in the previous section and were excavated using natural stratigraphy. Zone 1 consisted brown sandy soils with varying amounts of brick and/or shell and in some areas consisted of colluvial soils. Zone 1a consisted of dark midden soils which underlaid colluvium, and Zone 2 consisted of lighter midden soils, where they existed.

Flotation samples (typically 5 gallons in size) were collected from areas which exhibited a high potential for the recovery of ethnobotanical remains.

Brick was also weighed and discarded in the field. Examples of whole brick from the different excavation areas were collected for comparative and qualitative purposes.

All fill was screened through ¼-inch mesh, with samples of midden soils screened through ½-inch mesh for improved data recovery. A shell column sample (2.25 feet square) was collected to provided analysis on midden density and shellfish seasonality.

All units were plotted and photographed (in black and white negative and color slide film) at the base of excavation units, as well as appropriate profiles.

Features were plotted and photographed and the fill was screened through either ¼-inch or ½-inch mesh and samples were taken for water flotation and permanent curation.

A total of 913.5 person hours were devoted to the field work and 106 person hours to the field processing of archaeological specimens for a total of 1019.5 person hours. 2100 square feet (or 2235 cubic feet) of soil was moved producing 6848 lbs. of shell and 2130 lbs. of brick and mortar rubble. A total of 100 square feet was excavated beyond the 2000 square feet initially proposed.

Findings

Since none of the analysis has been performed on the artifacts from the West Pasture site, general comments will be made about each of the six areas excavated. Figure 13 provides an uncorrected field map showing the location of excavation areas and units across the site.

Nine areas of interest were identified through auger testing and metal detection. Of those nine areas, five were believed to contain the most valuable, non-repetitive information based on temporal association and foot print. Each of these areas are briefly considered in the following discussions.

Excavated Areas

Area 1 represents a relatively high status early to mid eighteenth century domestic occupation. In addition, there was a light to moderate scatter of Late Woodland/Mississippian artifacts. Based on previous research at the West Pasture site, it is believed that this is the area identified by John Combes and more intensively investigated by Jim Michie.

At least three structures were identified at the base of excavations, although none were fully exposed (Figure 14). The first and earliest structure is a prehistoric house represented by three post holes. Upon excavation of the posts, they were found to contain almost exclusively prehistoric artifacts. All of

these posts contained flecks of charcoal, suggesting that it had burned. Extrapolating from these posts and assuming a circular configuration the structure measures approximately 15 feet in diameter.

The second structure is an eighteenth century building with three posts clearly associated based on content and alignment. The size of the structure is unknown and it is oriented N51°E. One of the postholes contained a large portion of a charred post. Very few of the historic artifacts at the site were burnt, so it is believed that the builder charred the ends of posts to deter decay. This was a common practice and was discussed in detail in several early 19th century building guides (see Fitchen 1988:133).

A third structure was represented by a small portion of a brick pier only one course deep. This pier was oriented with magnetic north. Underlying the pier were flecks of charcoal, clearly indicating that a burning episode took place before this structure was built. It is possible that this structure dates to later in the eighteenth century and possibly the early nineteenth century. This argument will be made more clearly in the summary.

A total of 400 square feet (350 cubic feet) was excavated at the site yielding 582 lbs. of brick. While some shell was present at the site, most of it was believed to be structural.

Area 2 represents a low status early to late nineteenth century domestic area. No structural remains were encountered at this area, but a dense midden of oyster shell with a relatively large quantity of whelks was investigated (Figure 15). These excavation revealed that beneath the dark mid to late nineteenth century midden was a deposit of earlier artifacts (primarily pearlware), suggesting that there were two distinct occupations in this area.

Two hundred of the 400 square feet were excavated in non-midden areas closer to Salt House Creek. A much larger quantity of architectural materials (dating to the mid to late 19th century) was encountered here suggesting that a structure was located somewhere between the shell midden and the creek.

A total of 440 cubic feet of soil was excavated yielding 2469 lbs. of shell and 347 lbs. of brick.

Area 3 is located on the edge of a large concentration of artifacts, brick, and shell (approximately 300 feet north-south by 250 feet east-west). Since the concentration was so large, a metal detector was used to isolate areas where structures should be found. Two concentrations of metal artifacts (Areas 3 and 4) were identified, and an additional area was identified as a concentration of brick rubble on the ground surface. Interestingly, Areas 3 and 4 were located in low artifact density areas. This may suggest that many activities which would have produced large quantities of artifacts took place close to Salt House Creek. It is also possible that this is the area of the 19th century wharf illustrated on an 1848 plat (Figure 4).

Area 3 represents a late 18th/early 19th century low status domestic occupation. Excavations uncovered one entire structure measuring approximately 8 by 10 feet and oriented N2°W (Figure 16). The structure had a post and trench foundation. Based on the lack of tabby mortar or clay daub, it was possibly a wattled house. A door is centered in the north wall and there is a small room (approximately 3 by 8 feet) partitioned off from the rest of the structure. In the larger portion of the structure was a shallow pit which contained a hoe with a split blade, an intact essence of peppermint bottle, and a number of broken domestic artifacts. This may have functioned as a storage pit. Another feature (Feature 8) was located on the south wall intruding into the structural features suggesting that it post dates the house.

Additional posts were found to the north and west of the house. All were relatively shallow and may be associated with outdoor domestic activities. A total of 400 square feet or 380 cubic feet were excavated which recovered 169 lbs. of brick rubble and 1033 lbs. of shell.

Area 4 represents a late 18th century low status domestic occupation. A structure measuring

approximately 8 by 8 feet was uncovered which is oriented with magnetic north (Figure 17). The foundation consists of deeply placed corner posts, an additional post on the south wall, and a shallow shell filled trench. An opening was found on the northern end of the west wall and there was a highly mottled stain outside of the opening, suggesting a heavily trafficked area.

Immediately north of the structure was a shell midden containing a relatively high quantity of artifacts. Excavations west of the structure produced few artifacts.

Area 5 is an early to mid-19th century low status domestic occupation. Excavation units uncovered a central brick chimney and three posts associated with one bay of double pen structure. Based on these posts, each bay measures 14 feet by at least 22 feet (Figure 18). The structure is located in an unusual topographic area. It is situated in a trough between two dune ridges (Figure 19).

To the west of the structure is a shell midden containing early 19th century artifacts. Overlying this midden is about 1 foot of colluvium containing sparser and later artifacts. Immediately adjacent to the chimney were large quantities of large artifacts and the bulk of the chimney stack had been completely robbed. This suggests that after the house was abandoned, the brick were used elsewhere and this low spot was used as a trash dump.

A total of 400 square feet or 565 cubic feet of soil was moved in this area yielding 825 lbs. of brick and 919 lbs. of shell.

Area 6 is an early to mid 18th century low status domestic occupation. This area was originally identified as a small concentration of artifacts. Additional shovel testing in this area revealed a relatively dense concentration of early artifacts. As a result, 100 square feet or 80 cubic feet was excavated to explore this area. These excavations yielded 30 lbs. of brick and 262 lbs. of shell.

Excavations revealed a portion of a continuous brick footing for a structure of unknown size (Figure 20). The footing was not deeply set and did not extend more than about 0.1 foot beneath the subsoil. This foundation consisted of mortared brick fragments which further suggested a low status occupation or use. The structure was oriented N63°W or N37°E which provides a 100° angle. This suggests that the structure was either very sloppily constructed or was displaced. In fact, there are three linear stains at the base of excavations which appear to be plowscars.

Features

Twelve features (not including post holes) were identified and excavated during this research. These features are illustrated on the block excavation plan views.

Feature 1 consists of a relatively shallow smear of charcoal surrounding and underlying the brick pier identified in Area 1. The feature was nearly void of artifacts except for a few prehistoric ceramics which suggests a prehistoric origin. It is in close proximity to post features believed to be associated with a prehistoric house. The feature is linear measuring about six feet north-south by one to two feet east-west. It varies from 0.4 to 0.7 feet in depth.

Feature 2 is a shallow depression of brick and mortar rubble and is probably associated with the brick structure located in Area 1. The feature measures 3.5 feet north-south and 2.5 feet east west and is 0.4 feet deep. This is probably a robbed out portion of a wall or footing. The feature contained 37 lbs. of brick and mortar.

Feature 3 is a pit (located at Area 1) containing both historic and prehistoric materials as well as a large chunk of carbonized wood at the base. The feature may have originally functioned as a post hole which was later dug into for another purpose. The feature is 2.2 feet east-west by at least 2.0 feet north-south. The feature

contained 3 lbs. of brick.

Feature 4 is a drainage ditch located in Area 2. The ditch is located in a lower portion of the area. Surrounding excavations indicated water washing and gully running perpendicular to the ditch. This ditch contained historic artifacts and 20 lbs. of shell. The total length is unknown and the width is about 1.0 feet.

Feature 5 is the wall trench associated with the structure uncovered in Area 4. Each of the four walls were excavated separately and collectively contained 57 lbs. of shell. The trench varied in width from 1.0 to 2.0 feet and depth varied from 0.2 to 0.5 feet.

Feature 6 is a shallow depression just north of the structure in Area 4 which contained a moderate amount of burnt animal bone and charcoal. It is possible that the feature represents a yard hearth. The feature contained 6 lbs. of shell and measured 2.0 feet north-south by at least 1.5 feet east-west. It was a maximum of 0.4 feet deep.

Feature 7 is also a shallow depression located just southwest of the structure in Area 4. The depression contained 5 lbs. of shell and 2 lbs. of brick. Its function is not clear, but it may be a dripline. The feature is 1.2 feet east-west by at least 3.0 feet north-south.

Feature 8 is a bowl shaped shell filled pit in Area 3. The pit contained solely intertidal cluster oysters. Very few right valves were present. Although no clear evidence for steaming was noted, the pit may have been used as a single episode of steaming. This feature overlies and probably post dates Feature 9 (wall trench feature).

The feature measure 2.2 feet north-south by 2.4 feet east-west and its maximum depth was 1.06 feet. Oyster from the pit weighed 19 lbs. and a hand picked sample was collected for further analysis.

Feature 9 is a wall trench for a post and trench structure at Area 3. As with Feature 5, the four walls were excavated separately. Nine posts were located at the base of the trench and were excavated as Feature 9, post holes 1 through 9. Negligible amounts of shell were recovered which suggests that this was the first building to occupy this particular spot. The trench varied from 0.4 to 0.8 feet in width and varied in depth from 0.3 to 0.6 feet in depth.

Feature 9a is a pit located in the center of the structure represented by Feature 9. The pit appears to have functioned for storage and is 1.2 feet east-west by 2.6 feet north-south with a maximum depth of 0.76 feet.

Feature 10 is the interior of the firebox and hearth for the west side of the chimney found in Area 5. This firebox had a layer of shell at the base which appears to have supported a brick bottom to the firebox. It is unknown if the brick extended into the hearth area. It should be noted that all of the accessible brick from the chimney had been robbed which left little evidence for understanding the exact construction for the floor of the hearth. Feature 10 contained 195 lbs. of brick and 116 lbs. of shell.

Feature 11 is the interior of the firebox for the east side of the chimney found in Area 5. The hearth on this side was not exposed. The interior of this firebox had been robbed entirely of usable brick and consisted almost entirely of dirt, brick, and mortar fill. If shell was indeed used to support a brick floor to the firebox, it is not known why this would also have been robbed since only 8 lbs. of shell was recovered. Brick and mortar rubble weighed 374 lbs.

Table 3 provides a summary of the content of the three middens explored including the density of shellfish and the species present. The table reveals much diversity among the middens. Given the temporal spread represented, this diversity may indicate changing tastes in shellfish. For instance, at the Vanderhorst Plantation, post-bellum middens contained large quantities of whelk as does 750R140 which

contains artifacts dating into the late 19th century.

Table 3.
38CH123, Shell Midden Content and Density, weight in pounds.

Excavation Unit	Area	Percent by Wt.		Clam	Total Whelk	Wt.	Temporal Wt./Ft ³	Period
		Shell:Soil	Oyster					
165R130	5	1:10.76	86.96	13.08		578	9.63	early/mid 19th c.
470R100	4	1:5.17	95.24	4.76		971	9.71	late 18th c.
750R140	2	1:2.93	57.63	1.70	40.67	1450	14.50	early/late 19th c.

Summary

The excavations at the West Pasture site (38CH123) examined six areas and uncovered all or parts of six structures dating from the early to mid-18th century to the mid-to late 19th century. In addition a portion of a late prehistoric structure was identified. Table 4 provides a summary of this information.

In sum, the excavations have covered the range of 18th and 19th century occupations at the West

Table 4.
Summary of excavations, 38CH123

Location	Status	Structural remains	Structural Orientation	Time Period Represented
Area 1	Prehistoric	Yes	Circular?	L Woodland/Miss.
Area 1	High	Yes	N51°E	Early/Mid 18th c.
Area 1	High	Yes	N	Early/Mid 18th c.
Area 2	Low	No	N/A	Early to Late 19th c.
Area 3	Low	Yes	N2°W	Late 18th/Early 19th c.
Area 4	Low	Yes	N	Late 18th c.
Area 5	Low	Yes	N	Early to Mid 19th c.
Area 6	Low	Yes	N35°E	Early to Mid 18th c.

Pasture site. The presence of an early high status occupation dating to the early to mid 18th century suggests the possibility that John Stanyarne built a relatively impermanent house here until his more permanent home (38CH122) was constructed to the west of Salt House Creek. Previous work at 38CH122 suggests that the plantation house was not constructed until about 1765, based on the ceramics recovered from the builder's trench. Historical research suggests that serious plantation activities began on the island in the 1720s (Trinkley 1993).

In addition to the early high status occupation, a low status occupation dating from the same period was identified in the same general area of the site. Both structures were aligned on different orientations. The low status structure probably housed slaves who worked at the main house.

It appears that after this area of the site was abandoned for the west side of Salt House Creek, a slave row of small, impermanent structures was built and the plantation complex was aligned with magnetic north. Two of these slave structures were completely excavated (Area 3 and Area 4).

By the early 19th century, this type of housing was abandoned for more permanent housing. One of these structures was partially uncovered and consisted of a double penned, central brick chimney, with a wooden post foundation.

In essence, the Stanyarne Plantation developed much like other plantations in the low country. Building periods appear to be 1720-1765-Impermanent temporary housing; 1765- Construction of permanent main house; 1765-1820-Development of slave row with small, impermanent housing; and 1820-1865 larger, more permanent slave housing. Analysis of temporally sensitive artifacts will refine this field impression in the final report.

The final report will compare Stanyarne Plantation to other plantations on the island, other sea island plantations, and main land plantations.

SOURCES CITED

- Anonymous
1939 Letters from Col. Lewis Morris to Miss Ann Elliot. *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 40:122-136.
- Coclanis, Peter
1989 *The Shadow of a Dream: Economic Life and Death in the South Carolina Low Country 1670-1920*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Combes, John
1975 The Archaeology of Kiawah Island. In *Environmental Inventory of Kiawah Island*, edited by William M. Campbell and John Mark Dean, pp. A-1 - A-32. Environmental Research Center, Inc., Columbia.
- Fitchen, John
1988 *Building Construction Before Mechanization*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Jones, Alice H.
1980 *Wealth of a Nation to be: The American Colonies on the Eve of the Revolution*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- McCaskey, Glen
1990 Kiawah During the American Revolution. *Kiawah Island Legends* 1(1): 86-88.
- Stegeman, John F. and Janet A. Stegeman
1977 *Caty: A Biography of Catharine Littlefield Greene*. Rhode Island Bicentennial Foundation, Providence.
- Trinkley, Michael, editor
1993 *The History and Archaeology of Kiawah Island, Charleston County, South Carolina*. Chicora Foundation Research Series 30. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia, South Carolina.